

## Higher Education Accountability Plans

October 2001

### BACKGROUND

The six public baccalaureate institutions have submitted their 2001-2003 accountability plans to the Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB). The Board must review these plans and set biennial performance targets for each institution.

The institutions will not submit reports on their 2000-2001 performance on the accountability measures until November 2001. Therefore, the Board will not be considering new information on institutional performance at this time.

### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY AND DEADLINES

The operating budget for the 2001-2003 biennium (*Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6153, Section 601*) called for the institutions to develop accountability plans under the Board's direction.

*Each institution receiving appropriations under sections 604 through 609 of this act shall submit a biennial plan to achieve measurable and specific improvement each academic year as part of a continuing effort to make meaningful and substantial progress towards the achievement of the following long-term performance goals. The plans, to be prepared at the direction of the Higher Education Coordinating Board, shall be submitted by August 15, 2001. The Higher Education Coordinating Board shall set biennial performance targets for each institution and shall review actual achievements annually. Institutions shall track their actual performance on the statewide measures as well as faculty productivity, the goals and targets for which may be unique to each institution.*

Because of the late passage of the budget, agency staff requested that the institutions be granted an extension of the deadline for the submission of plans to October 10. This request was granted. At its September meeting, the Board approved guidelines for the preparation of the accountability plans. The institutions were asked to develop their plans in accordance with these guidelines.

### ACTION REQUIRED

The Board must set performance targets for the institutions for the 2001-2003 biennium. The Board must report to the Legislature on the plans and institutional performance in November 2003.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Board set targets for the 2001-2003 biennium at the levels proposed in the institutions' performance accountability plans.

## **THE BOARD'S NOVEMBER 2000 PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT**

The Board's November 2000 Performance Accountability report acknowledged that there are significant flaws in some of the measures of institutional performance required by the Legislature. Despite these flaws, it recommended continuation of the statewide measures and several other actions. The table below summarizes the Board's recommendations for 2001-2003 and the impact of those recommendations.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Recommendation accepted?</b>
Continue the statewide measures	Yes
No budget penalties for failure to meet targets	Yes
Priority in 2001-2003 Fund for Innovation projects for accountability and assessment efforts	No
Continuation and refinement of institution-specific goals and performance measures	Yes; some institutions report refinement of institution-specific measures
The Legislature should reevaluate its performance goals for the statewide measures	No

## SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF PLAN TARGETS

### Assessment

*In almost every case the institutions' 2001-2003 targets exceed 1996-1999 baseline performance. All of these targets would, if achieved, represent "meaningful and substantial progress toward the achievement of long-term performance goals."*

*The exceptions are reasonable. For example,*

- The Evergreen State College's (TESC) transfer Graduation Efficiency Index (GEI) is already 6 to 12 percentage points higher than those of the other institutions. It has met the Legislature's long-term goals and there is little room for improvement on this measure.
- Western Washington University (WWU) probably cannot improve on its five-year *graduation* rates in this biennium because it has (due to declining selectivity and some of the consequences of enrollment increases) suffered declines in freshman *retention* the past few years.
- Central Washington University (CWU) is concerned that faculty participation rates in formal mentoring programs has been declining but sees this as a function of unexpected enrollment shortfalls that limited resources for formal programs. Further, the institution believes that *actual* mentoring has not declined at all, and will seek to develop a more refined "mentorship" measure.
- Western Washington University (WWU) projects a small increase in retention, but indicates that its research suggests that it cannot do much better than an 85 percent retention rate. This is a ceiling set by the rates at which students leave the university for desirable reasons or due to poor grades.
- The University of Washington (UW) and Washington State University (WSU) report that they have already exceeded long-term targets for performance on some institution-specific measures. They will sustain and expand their efforts in these areas.

*In some cases institutions have set aggressive targets they are not confident they can meet in the coming biennium. They see aggressive targeting as consistent with the pursuit of the long-term goals set by the Legislature and the demand for continued efforts at improvement. For example,*

- TESC notes the apparent stability of freshman GEI but, "in the spirit of developing more experience with this measure" and in view of the Legislature's long-term performance goals, it set high interim targets for GEI. TESC set aggressive retention targets that it knows it will not be able to attain, but finds that "striving for them is the clearest path we can see to achieving the long-term five-year graduation rate goal."
- WWU is actively engaged in efforts to improve freshman retention and it has set aggressive targets for this biennium, although the reforms that it implements are unlikely to have significant effects until 2003-2005.

- CWU set a graduation rate target of 5.6 percentage points in the coming biennium, though it is uncertain that it can sustain the significant improvements on this measure that it has seen in recent years.
- EWU set particularly ambitious targets for increased graduation rates, based in part on a strong undergraduate retention record.

### **Cautionary Notes**

As the HECB noted in its last report, the highly aggregated performance measures are substantially outside the control of the institutions. *Some of these institutions have 15 years of data on retention, graduation rates, and the GEI. They have found that common to each measure is a pattern of small and apparently random fluctuation around a stable, long-run core.* In light of all of the factors affecting institutional performance on these measures and the long-term stability of institutional performance, projecting improvement over the 1996-99 baseline is, in some cases, problematic.

### **Conclusions**

The institutions' many efforts to improve performance on the measures (e.g., improved advising, streamlined course enrollment practices, better freshman and transfer orientation efforts, better transfer articulation) will almost certainly enhance the experiences of undergraduate students at Washington's public baccalaureates. With this, the institutions will increase the effectiveness of their use of public resources. This will be the case even though the institutions' measured performance varies from year-to-year in ways that are beyond their control. Some benefits of the accountability process may not be easily measurable despite continuing (and justified) efforts to quantify results.

Is institutional performance on the statewide measures improving? The answer will depend on the baseline we choose. Some institutions report long-term improvements on some of the accountability measures, and this may indicate that the accountability planning process has had some beneficial consequences. If we take the four measures (GEI for freshman and transfers, undergraduate retention, and graduation rates) at six institutions, we have 24 total measures. If we compare the 1995-98 baseline to average performance in 1998-00, performance on 13 of the 24 measures went up, nine went down, and two were unchanged. (The University of Washington and The Evergreen State College showed improvement on each of the four measures in this comparison; the rest of the institutions showed mixed results.) This mixed pattern should not be very surprising given the nature of the accountability measures.

Several plans mention the importance that learning outcomes assessment efforts are playing in the institutions' thinking about accountability. TESC notes the impact of re-accreditation demands on its approach to specifying and measuring student learning outcomes. Several institutions see their participation in the inter-institutional assessment teams on quantitative reasoning, writing, information technology, and critical thinking as part of the larger effort to measure and improve institutional performance. These groups will report to the Board by the

year's end, and at this time it may be reasonable to ask whether these efforts can be expanded into effective statewide assessment systems.

The Board and the Legislature may also be interested in how the demands of accrediting agencies for information about learning objectives and outcomes are affecting the delivery of undergraduate education. The institutions' responses to these demands have implications for institutional accountability as well as assessment processes. In any case, to the extent that they think that assessment should be a fundamental part of the accountability planning and reporting process, the institutions must find ways to demonstrate the value of assessment data to policymakers interested in accountability.

## **SUMMARY OF SELECTED NEW INITIATIVES**

No accountability plan can describe all institutional practices that affect the institutions' performance on the performance measures. No summary of accountability plans can include all of the strategies and initiatives described in those plans. The state colleges and universities are engaged in many continuing and new efforts to improve graduation efficiency, retention, and graduation rates. This is a brief summary of a few selected initiatives described in the institutions' accountability plans.

### **Central Washington University**

The new provost and interim associate vice president appointed in summer 2001 will review current initiatives, plan new initiatives, and develop new measures. This review flows from dissatisfaction with current faculty productivity measures and the ways that the institution has measured minority student progress at CWU. CWU will also review its target for internship participation for students to determine whether the upper bound expectation for participation (10 percent) is too low.

### **Eastern Washington University**

- Program reviews to streamline major size
- Refinement of articulation agreements with community colleges
- Implementation of EagleNet, online registration
- "Finish-in-Four" programs
- Diversifying advising into colleges and departments

### **The Evergreen State College**

TESC's plan describes many ongoing efforts in considerable detail. Some newer initiatives include:

***Efforts to improve graduation efficiency:***

- New faculty advising requirement approved spring 2001.
- Per-quarter credit limit increased from 16 to 20 units in fall 2001; this may shorten time to degree for some students.
- Increased limit for transfer credit and/or concurrent enrollment credit that will count toward the degree from 16 to 20 credit hours.
- Seeking enabling legislation to begin a Running Start program at TESC.
- Continuing refinement of freshman and transfer advising structures.

***Efforts to improve retention and graduation rates:***

- Implementing strategies to improve academic advising information and timing among faculty and through the Academic Advising Office.
- New faculty advising requirement approved spring 2001.
- Two-year pilot project to assess the impact of an intrusive advising model on student retention.
- Enhanced attention to the first-year student's experience on campus.

***Institution-specific measures:***

- January 2001 faculty approval of "Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate." These expectations are now factoring in curriculum, course construction, and advising.
- Restructured the Learning Resource Center, with two new directors hired to assist in supporting changes in general education.

**University of Washington**

- Focus efforts to improve GEIs on transfer students in science and engineering.
- Test run for the Degree Audit Requirement System in the coming academic year.
- Introduction of the Mutual Research Transcript Enterprise (MRTE), a data-sharing project between the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges (SBCTC) and the UW. The MRTE allows research focused on enrollment and course-taking patterns and improves the transfer articulation process. For example, community college researchers can now learn how students who completed a particular series of courses at their institutions performed at the UW. UW is attempting to expand the MRTE dataset to include other public four-year colleges in the state.
- Offering pay and/or credit to highly motivated undergraduates for intensive work with faculty members in research with goal of involving 600 undergraduates (in 1995-1996, 300 students were involved).
- Efforts to increase the proportion of UW students receiving individualized instruction.
- Ambitious efforts to increase the number of students involved in public service internships and having some research experience with faculty.

**Washington State University**

- Institution-wide Strategic Planning Process including an oversight committee, nine design teams, and public meetings, information-gathering sessions, and public review. The design team reports have produced two central goals: an aspiration to be recognized as offering the best undergraduate experience at a research university, and a renewed emphasis on the factors that support quality research and WSU's stature among research universities. This process is likely to yield the creation of an *Office of Undergraduate Education* with responsibilities for enhancing the undergraduate experience.
- *WSU has recently hired a new Vice President for Student Affairs.* This represents "a greater focus at a higher level than in the past on the student experience in the classroom." This replaces a system in which a Vice Provost for Student Affairs reported to the Provost.
- *In spring 2002, WSU opens its Center for Undergraduate Education.* This center will house a Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology, the General Education Program, the university's writing programs, and the Student Computing Center.
- *Concerted effort to raise the academic level of the entering class.* WSU is focusing its recruitment and scholarship initiatives on attracting better prepared students and expects that its minimum admissions index for routine admissions will gradually rise.
- *Focusing on contributions that assessment initiatives can make to the accountability discussion.* WSU is exploring ways that its Critical Thinking Rubric, supported by grants from the Fund for Innovation grant and FIPSE, can be integrated with the writing, quantitative reasoning, and information and technology literacy assessment efforts that are underway.

**Western Washington University**

- *Revising the General Education program to enhance student engagement.* This effort is aimed at improving freshman retention rates and will affect the institution's approach to the goal of increasing the student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in writing-intensive courses. The effort is aimed more broadly at improving institutional performance on all of the accountability measures by improving students' experiences and increasing student engagement with the university. It is hoped that this effort will have larger effects on the quality of the undergraduate experience at Western.
  - ✓ Last year WWU published its Quality Undergraduate Education Report articulating its vision of the qualities it wishes to impart to its undergraduates.
  - ✓ In fall 2001, a faculty taskforce and five working groups will define expected student learning outcomes in the General Education program. The taskforce will then develop major options for implementing a revised General Education program. 2001-2003 will see faculty-wide assessment of the options and planning for implementation.

- *Advising.* Assessment research has suggested that advising can be strengthened and that improving the advising program will have beneficial effects on retention and graduation rates. *Western has significantly upgraded advising by major departments, and is now developing plans to improve lower-division, pre-major advising.*
  - ✓ New Assistant Vice President of Academic Support Services is charged with developing a strategic plan for lower-division advising.
  - ✓ Planning begins in fall 2001 and will continue throughout the year, and perhaps into next year.



**SUMMARIES OF INSTITUTIONAL TARGETS  
AND  
INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES**

**Central Washington University**

**Eastern Washington University**

**The Evergreen State College**

**University of Washington**

**Washington State University**

**Western Washington University**

## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<b><i>COMMON MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
•Freshman	88.0%	90.0%	2.0
•Transfers	83.8%	85.0%	1.2
<b>Undergraduate Retention (Overall)</b>	80.5%	84.0%	3.5
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>	39.4%	45.0%	5.6
<b><i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Expected learning outcomes	92.6%	100%	7.4
% faculty mentoring students	22.5%	22.5%	0
Student-faculty ratio	22.2	22.5	0.3
<b>Other Measures</b>			
Transfer students with declared majors	75.1%	77.0%	1.9
Minority graduation rate	22.6%	24.0%	1.4
Internship participation	7.3%	8.0%	0.7

## CENTRAL WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

### *Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

**Student Learning Outcomes:** Percentage of degree programs with specifically stated, publicized learning outcomes.

**% Faculty Mentoring Students:** Percentage of full-time faculty mentoring students in established programs that incorporate a faculty student mentoring relationship (e.g., CWU research symposium, McNair Scholars Program).

**Ratio of Student FTE to Faculty FTE:** The ratio of FTE students to the FTE faculty for IPEDS faculty.

**Transfer Students with Declared Majors:** The percentage of undergraduate transfer students who have declared majors by the end of their third quarter at CWU.

**Minority Graduation Rate:** Ratio of the number of minority students graduating to all enrolled minority students fall quarter (averaged over three years).

**Internship Participation:** Percentage of students participating in cooperative education internships (averaged over three years).

## EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<b>COMMON MEASURES</b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
Freshman	87.9%	91.0%	2.2
Transfers	77.9%	83.1%	5.2
<b>Undergraduate Retention (Overall)</b>	88.5%	89.2%	0.7
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>	41.7%	49.0%	7.3
<b>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Student credit hours/FTE faculty	305.9	333.6	27.7
<b>Other Measures</b>			
Use of enrollment resources	48.5%	--	--
Internship/service learning experience	2,422	2,998	576
Courses using distance learning technology	6.4	37	30.6
Freshman academic involvement index	33.7	37	3.3

---

**EASTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

***Description of Institution-Specific Measures***

**Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty:** A ratio of student credit hours to the number of IPEDS-defined faculty for fall quarter.

**Use of Enrollment Resources:** This measure was eliminated as of the 2000 plan.

**Experiential Learning (previously entitled Internship/Service Learning Experience):** Total number of students taking experientially-based courses including research directed studies, internship, cooperative education and/or service learning credits.

**Courses Using Distance Learning Technology:** The annual number of courses offered by faculty who use the worldwide web.

**Freshman Academic Involvement Index:** The sample average for an 11-question index derived from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) administered annually to students.

**THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE**

	<b>1996-99 Baseline Performance</b>	<b>2001-03 Plan Target</b>	<b>Projected Improvement from Baseline</b>
<b><i>COMMON MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
Freshman	93.0%	94.0%	1.0
Transfers	90.0%+	90.0%+	0.0
<b>Undergraduate Retention</b>			
Overall	76.0%	78.0%	2.0
Freshman	65.0%	75.0%	10.0
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>	45.0%	46.0%	1.0
<b><i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Life-long Learning Index, Undergrads	31.7	31.9	0.2
Freshman "Familiarity w/ Computers"	2.28	2.48	.20
Freshman "Quantitative Thinking"	1.88	2.08	.20
<b>Other Measures: Diversity</b>			
Retention of students of color, Olympia campus	77.0%	80.0%	3.0
Student diversity learning	3.18	3.49	.31

+Meets long-term performance goal set by the Legislature.

## THE EVERGREEN STATE COLLEGE

### *Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

**Life-Long Learning Index:** TESC has used the “Life-Long Learning Index” from the College Student Experience Questionnaire (CSEQ) as its faculty productivity measure. This index is a composite measure of students’ estimated gains in learning in the following 11 areas: specialization for further education, broad general education, writing, familiarity with computers, understanding/getting along with different kinds of people, working as a team member, understanding developments in science/technology, analytical/ logical thinking, quantitative thinking, synthesizing ideas, and learning on your own. For the current biennium, Evergreen is focusing on two specific items within this index, specifically improvement reported by **freshmen** students. The items are learning gains in “**familiarity with the use of computers**” and “**quantitative thinking**.” This focus is consistent with institutional initiatives related to General Education at Evergreen.

**Retention:** While reporting overall fall-to-fall retention, Evergreen continues to focus on retention of freshmen students in the current biennium. Again, this is consistent with an internal focus on improvement. Evergreen also selected retention of students of color on the Olympia campus as one of its two institution-specific diversity measures.

**Student Diversity Learning:** Students’ reported gains at Evergreen in “understanding other people and the ability to get along with different kinds of people” (from the Life-Long Learning Index/CSEQ).

## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<b>COMMON MEASURES</b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
Freshman	89.6%	93.2%	3.6
Transfers	81.7%	87.0%	5.3
<b>Undergraduate Retention (Overall)</b>	87.2%	92.4%	5.2
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>	63.8%	65.0%+	1.2
<b>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Enrollment demand satisfied	84.8%	89.4%	4.6
Quality of instruction	93.7%	96.9%	3.2
Research funding/faculty member	\$216,774	*	*
Student credit hours/faculty FTE	202.9	209.5	6.6
<b>Other Measures</b>			
# undergrads with intense research involvement	1,122	<u>Met</u>	**
Individualized instruction	4.0%	4.6%	0.6
Public service internships	842	1,535	693
% undergrads in faculty research	22.4%	23.7%	1.3

+This goal meets long-term performance goal set by Legislature.

\*Performance is dependent on availability of federal research funds.

\*\*UW's initial goal for 2004-05 was 600; they have exceeded this goal and promise continuing aggressive effort in this area.



## UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

### *Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

**Enrollment Demand Satisfied:** The proportion of enrollment demand satisfied by offered enrollment space (course openings).

**Quality of Instruction:** Percent of students evaluating “amount your learned in the course” as “good or better” (3.0 or above on 5 point scale) on standardized course evaluations.

**Funding for Research per Faculty FTE:** Grants and contracts per faculty FTE (in nominal dollars).

**Student Credit Hours Instructed Per Faculty FTE:** Hours at graduate level are multiplied by 1.5 hours, then added to undergraduate hours to create total student credit hours.

**Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction:** Numbers of hours taken as individualized instruction/all undergraduate hours.

**Number of Undergraduates Intensively Involved in Research:** Number of students who receive research grants, data provided by Office of Undergraduate Education.

**Percent Undergraduate Credits Taken as Individualized Instruction:** This measures one-on-one mentoring opportunities for undergraduates offered by University faculty.

**Number of Undergraduates Involved with Public Service Internships:** Data provided by Carlson Center For Public Service.

**Percent of Undergraduates Reporting a Research Experience with Faculty:** Derived from an annual survey of graduating senior students, provides a measure of the cumulative experience over all undergraduate years.

## WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

	1996-99 Baseline Performance	2001-03 Plan Target	Projected Improvement from Baseline
<b><i>COMMON MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
Freshman	90.0%	91.5%	1.5
Transfers	81.0%	83.6%	2.6
<b>Undergraduate Retention</b>			
Overall	84.4%	86.4%	2.0
Freshman	83.7%	84.7%	1.0
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>	53.8%	55.9%	2.1
<b><i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Student credit hours/FTE faculty	198.5	207.7	9.2
Individualized enrollment/faculty	3.7	3.8	0.1
Research and scholarship	80.3%	<u>Met</u>	*
<b>Other Measures: Technology for Learning</b>			
Distance student credit hours	24,204	<u>Met</u>	*
Degree programs via distance	6	12	6
Reengineered courses	131	<u>Met</u>	*
Classrooms with technology	51.4%	70.0%	18.6

\*2004-2005 targets in these areas have been met or exceeded.

## WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

### *Description of Institution-Specific Measures*

**Freshman Retention:** In order to better manage its efforts, WSU has set a target for Freshman Retention rather than for Overall Retention, while continuing to report Overall Retention as well.

**Individualized Enrollment/Faculty:** Measures the amount of work faculty do with students in the form of supervising undergraduate research, internships, senior theses, private lessons, and independent studies. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the junior/senior classes.)

**Student Credit Hours per Faculty FTE:** Number of credit hours generated per instructional faculty FTE. (This measure tends to rise and fall with the size of the freshman/sophomore classes.)

**Research and Scholarship:** Percent of faculty completing the expected amount and type of scholarship during the past year, based on each college's definition of what constitutes scholarly work in that field.

**Distance Student Credit Hours:** Credit hours earned through interactive video courses, pre-recorded video courses, online courses and multiple mode courses.

**Degree Programs via Distance:** Number of different degree programs offered entirely at a distance, through electronic media such as interactive video, online courses, etc.

**Reengineered Courses:** Number of courses taught "primarily" by electronic means, including WHETS, online, e-mail, video-conference, etc.

**Classrooms with Technology:** Percent of university classrooms equipped to support technology-intensive teaching.

## WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

	<b>1996-99 Baseline Performance</b>	<b>2001-03 Plan Target</b>	<b>Projected Improvement from Baseline</b>
<b><i>COMMON MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Graduation Efficiency Index</b>			
Freshman	86.6%	87.0%	0.4
Transfers	80.5%	82.0%	1.5
Transfers graduating with a B.S. in science	71.3%	74.0%	2.7
<b>Undergraduate Retention</b>			
Overall	85.5%	86.0%	0.5
Freshman	80.3%	82.0%	1.7
<b>5-Year Graduation Rate</b>			
Freshman	54.0%	54.0%	0
Minority	38.4%	39.0%	0.6
<b><i>INSTITUTION-SPECIFIC MEASURES</i></b>			
<b>Faculty Productivity</b>			
Individualized Credit/FTE Student	1.43	1.5	0.07
SCH/Undergrad FTE in writing courses	2.1	2.25	.15
<b>Other Measures</b>			
Hours scheduled in computer labs	22.4	25.0	2.6
Departments adopting advising model	0	75%	50

**WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY*****Description of Institution-Specific Measures***

**Individualized Credit/FTE Student:** Measures the number of credits generated per FTE student through individual instructional activities, including internships, work on faculty research projects, and other one-on-one activities.

**SCH/Undergrad FTE in Writing Courses:** Student credit hours per undergraduate FTE in courses designated as principally or specifically writing-based.

**Hours Scheduled in Computer Labs:** Measures the number of student hours scheduled in university or departmental computer labs per FTE undergraduate.

**Departments Adopting Advising Model:** Measures the proportion of Western's academic departments that have fully implemented all elements of Western's Departmental Advising Model. Components: (a) a clearly defined departmental advising program, with advisor, location, hours, etc., easily accessible and known; (b) a departmental advising web page fully operational, based on the established template and criteria; (c) provision of an individualized, written plan of study to each student upon declaration of the major; (d) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help pre-majors decide on a major; and (e) sponsorship of at least one event annually to help advanced majors in the department explore career and graduate school options.

## PROJECTED IMPROVEMENTS OVER BASELINE PERFORMANCE

The tables below present information on baseline performance for 1996-1999, the 2001-2003 targets, and projected improvements over baseline performance.

Differences in institutional baselines can teach something about the unique characteristics of the institutions but they cannot tell us whether one institution is in fact performing better than another. *Differences in baseline performance are caused mainly by differences in the characteristics of the student populations the institutions serve.* For example, CWU and EWU admit more students with weak academic preparation than WWU and TESC. For this reason, CWU and EWU have lower graduation rates than Western and Evergreen.

*Projected improvements over baseline performance vary from institution to institution.* This variation results from differences in baselines (higher baselines may mean diminished room for improvement) and factors unique to each institution. For example, TESC's GEI is much higher than that seen at any other institution and there is little room for improvement; WWU cannot project improved graduation rates because it has suffered weak freshman retention in recent years. Further, some institutions have set aggressive baselines they are not certain they can meet in this biennium. They see efforts to reach ambitious objectives as the clearest path to the statewide goals set by the Legislature.

### I. GRADUATION EFFICIENCY INDEX: NATIVE FRESHMAN

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	88.0%	90.0%	2.0
EWU	87.9%	91.0%	2.2
TESC	93.0%	94.0%	1.0
WWU	86.6%	87.0%	0.4
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	89.6%	93.2%	3.6
WSU	90.0%	91.5%	1.5

### II. GRADUATION EFFICIENCY INDEX: TRANSFER STUDENTS

	1996-99 Baseline	2001-03 Target	Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	83.8%	85.0%	1.2
EWU	77.9%	83.1%	5.2
TESC	90.0%	90.0%	0
WWU	80.5%	82.0%	1.5
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	81.7%	87.0%	5.3
WSU	81.0%	83.6%	2.6

**III. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT RETENTION**

	<b>1996-99 Baseline</b>	<b>2001-03 Target</b>	<b>Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)</b>
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	80.5%	84.0%	3.5
EWU	88.5%	89.2%	0.7
TESC	76.0%	78.0%	2.0
WWU	85.5%	86.0%	0.5
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	87.2%	92.4%	5.2
WSU	84.4%	86.4%	2.0

**IV. 5-YEAR FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATE**

	<b>1996-99 Baseline</b>	<b>2001-03 Target</b>	<b>Projected Improvement Over 1996-99 Baseline (percentage points)</b>
<i>Comprehensive Universities and Colleges</i>			
CWU	39.4%	45.0%	5.6
EWU	41.7%	49.0%	7.3
TESC	45.0%	51.0%	6.0
WWU	54.0%	54.0%	0
<i>Research Universities</i>			
UW	63.8%	65.0%	1.2
WSU	53.8%	55.9%	2.1

**RESOLUTION NO. 01-33**

WHEREAS, In its 2001-2003 biennial budget, the Legislature directed the public baccalaureate institutions to prepare accountability plans for the 2001-2003 biennium that would lead to “measurable and specific” improvements toward the performance goals; and

WHEREAS, The Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB) developed and approved Accountability Guidelines in September 2001 for the institutions’ 2001-2003 Accountability Plans; and

WHEREAS, In the guidelines, the Higher Education Coordinating Board gave responsibility for setting meaningful targets to the institutions; and

WHEREAS, The institutions have presented their accountability plans to the Board;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Higher Education Coordinating Board approves the targets set in the 2001-2003 Accountability Plans presented by Central Washington University, Eastern Washington University, The Evergreen State College, University of Washington, Washington State University, and Western Washington University.

Adopted:

October 30, 2001

Attest:

---

Bob Craves, Chair

---

Gay Selby, Vice Chair